

REMARKS

The applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough examination of the application and requests reexamination and reconsideration of the application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner also rejects claims 1, 2, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Sawicki, claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, and 11 as allegedly being anticipated by Dongi *et al.*, and claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11, and 12 as allegedly being anticipated by Fuschetto. The Examiner further rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawicki, Dongi *et al.* or Fuschetto, in view of Shuskus *et al.* The Examiner also rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dongi *et al.* or Fuschetto view of Alden *et al.*

As discussed with the Examiner in an Examiner's Interview on December 21, 2006, the amendment to claim 1 as shown above under Amendment A appears to distinguish over the references cited by the Examiner above. Nowhere in the entire disclose of any of the cited references is there any teaching, suggestion, or disclosure of an integrated actuator meniscus mirror that includes an optical substrate including a mirror surface on one side and a support structure on the other side, the support structure including an array of intersecting major ribs wherein at least a plurality of said major ribs meet and cross each other; and a plurality of actuators each mounted in one of said major ribs spaced from and generally parallel to said mirror surface for applying bending moments to said mirror surface for controllably altering the shape of said mirror surface. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable and allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a) over the cited references.

The Examiner also indicated that combining the originally proposed amendment to

claim 1 that did not recite "wherein at least a plurality of said major ribs meet and cross each other" with the features of claim 8 or 11 would distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, as suggested by the Examiner, the applicant has added new claims 14 and 15 which include the features of claims 8 and 11, respectively. Accordingly, new claims 14 and 15 are allowable and patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 over the cited references. New claim 16, which depends from claim 15, is also allowable and patentable over the cited references.

Each of the Examiner's rejections has been addressed or traversed. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason this Response is found to be incomplete, or if at any time it appears that a telephone conference with counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned or his associates, collect in Waltham, Massachusetts, at (781) 890-5678.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "RJC", followed by a horizontal line.

Roy J. Coleman
Reg. No. 48,863